Appendix B

Results of a Telephone Interview With CAC Directors

To design an evaluation resource book that would benefit Child Advocacy Center (CAC) directors, it was necessary to understand the services that CACs provide. It was also important to learn what directors were doing in terms of evaluations and to elicit their thoughts on what the resource book should contain. Therefore, telephone interviews were conducted with CAC directors. CACs may have membership in the National Children's Alliance (referred to as member and associate member centers) or not (referred to as nonmember centers).

Methodology

Participants

A stratified random selection design (stratified by State, number of children served, ethnicity of children served, and member/nonmember status) was used to select potential participants. Participants were 117 CAC directors. Exhibit B.1 lists the directors' characteristics, shown by member and nonmember status and by the entire sample.

Semistructured interview

The investigator developed a semistructured interview. The first section of the interview asked about services provided by centers. This section was based on the National Children's Alliance proposed guidelines for membership. These are core components that are a part of the majority of the centers' programs—with the exception of organizational and cultural capacity (i.e., a child-friendly facility, a multidisciplinary team, a child investigative interview, a medical evaluation component, a mental health component, victim advocacy, case review, and case tracking). Results of this part of the survey are presented elsewhere (Jackson 2004).

The second section of the questionnaire asked directors about their activities and thoughts regarding evaluations. The results of this part of the survey are presented here.

Procedure

Letters were sent to invite 142 CAC administrators to participate in the study. Followup telephone calls were made to directors to schedule the telephone interview. Twenty-five centers either could not be contacted or were no longer a CAC (e.g., one nonmember program was redesigned to mentor adolescents).

Over a 4-month period of time, semistructured telephone interviews were conducted with 117 CAC administrators. The total sample consisted of 74 member administrators and 43 nonmember administrators. Contact was made with both a member and a nonmember center in every State but six where there were both types of centers. (Only a member center was contacted in Montana and only nonmember centers were contacted in Colorado, Indiana, South Carolina, Utah, and Vermont.) The interviews lasted between 30 and 120 minutes.

Results

Exhibit B.2 summarizes part of the telephone interview. Results revealed that many centers (53 percent) are conducting some type of evaluation.

As exhibit B.3 shows, many directors across the country are engaged in a number of different evaluation activities.

However, directors also had excellent ideas for needed research and evaluation (exhibit B.4). The percentage beside each type of evaluation or research question indicates the percentage of CAC directors who identified that evaluation or research activity. The exhibit is divided by member and nonmember status; to maintain anonymity, no identifying information is given as to which centers are engaged in which type of evaluation.

Exhibit B.1. Directors' Demographics

	Member (*N* = 74)		Nonmember (*N* = 43)		Total	
Directors' Background*	Social work	40%	Social work	59%	Social work	47%
	Business and social work	16%	Law enforcement	8%	Business and social work	11%
	Medical	7%	Counseling	5%	Medical	7%
			Medical	5%		
			Education	5%		
Directors' Education	MSW	22%	MSW	22%	MSW	22%
	MA Counseling	7%	MA Counseling	11%	MA Counseling	9%
	BS Education	7%	BS Social work	8%	BS Education	7%
	BS Nursing	6%	BS Criminal justice	6%	BS Social work	6%
	MA Public administration	6%	BS Nursing	6%	BS Nursing	6%
Length of Time as Director at the Center	Average	4.4 years	Average	4.2 years	Average	4.3 years
	Range	0–14 years	Range	0–12 years	Range	0–14 years

* Only the most common backgrounds and levels of education are presented here. A list of all directors' backgrounds and education is available from the author.
BA = Bachelor of Arts
BS = Bachelor of Science
MA = Master of Arts
MSW = Master of Social Work

Exhibit B.2. Results of Telephone Interviews With Child Advocacy Center Directors (*N* = 117)

Question	Directors' Responses	Respondents in Agreement
Are you conducting any kind of an assessment of your program?	Yes	53%
When did you begin the evaluation?*	At some point after the center was opened	63%
	At the time the center opened	37%
What kinds of things are you evaluating?*†	Client satisfaction	65%
	Agency satisfaction	62%
What made you decide to evaluate your program?*	For grants (writing or receiving grants)	19%
	To determine if our program is on track	10%
	To meet a requirement (e.g., parent organization)	10%
Who is doing the evaluation?*	CAC director and/or staff	71%
	External evaluator	20%
	A combination of internal and external individuals	9%
Whom would you prefer to conduct your evaluation?	Prefer a combination of internal and external	45%
	Prefer someone external	27%
	Prefer someone internal	21%
	I don't know	7%
What are some benefits to conducting an evaluation?†	To improve the program	56%
	To document how the center is doing	40%
	To obtain funding for the program	33%
	To be accountable to the community	9%
	To boost morale of staff and MDT members	8%
What are some barriers to conducting an evaluation?†	Time	40%
	Evaluation skill/knowledge	22%
	Money	21%
	Fear of results	21%
	No cooperation (team, families, staff)	21%
	No need for evaluation (e.g., "I just know")	7%
What are some things that might motivate you to begin an evaluation?†	If we wanted to improve our program	56%
	If we needed to document how we are doing	40%
	If we wanted to use the results to obtain funding	33%
	If we thought we needed to be responsive to the community's needs	9%
	If someone required it (e.g., parent organization)	9%
	If there was an evaluation tool	9%
	If we wanted to boost the morale of our staff and MDT members	8%
	If I was given the money to do the evaluation	6%
	If I was receiving complaints about the program	5%
	There are no motivators (e.g., "I know how the program is working")	4%
	If I had more time	2%
What kinds of things would you like to evaluate?†	Aspects of the center itself	50%
	Aspects of the MDT	44%
	The impact of the CAC on children	30%
	Client satisfaction	22%
	Aspects of therapy	18%
	Aspects of the child interview process	18%
	Research questions	18%
	Aspects of prosecution	16%
	Children's satisfaction with the center	15%
	Aspects of the medical examination	7%

Exhibit B.2. Results of Telephone Interviews With Child Advocacy Center Directors (*N* = 117) (continued)

Question	Directors' Responses	Respondents in Agreement
How much money would you be willing to spend on an evaluation?	I don't know	33%
	A lot	31%
	A small amount	24%
	Zero	12%

*These questions were asked only of center directors who were conducting an evaluation.
† Responses to these questions are not mutually exclusive.

Exhibit B.3. Percentage of CAC Evaluators Currently Engaged in Each Type of Evaluation Activity

Member		Nonmember	
Agency satisfaction	89%	Agency satisfaction	65%
Client satisfaction	70%	Client satisfaction	63%
Peer review of videotaped interviews	11%	Pre-post education evaluation	13%
MDT issues	11%	Prosecution rates	12%
Pre-post education evaluation	8%	Peer review of videotaped interviews	6%
Paperwork protocols	8%	Pre-post evaluation of groups or therapy	6%
Pre-post evaluation of groups or therapy	4%	Paperwork protocols	5%
Pre-post medical exam	3%	Evaluation of office staff	2%
Pre-post child interview	3%		
Focus groups	3%		
Child satisfaction	1%		
Co-locating assessment	*		
Community survey	*		
Cost-benefit analysis	*		
Evaluation of forensic evaluations	*		
Family pre-post therapy	*		
Mother advocate program	*		
Prosecution rates	*		
Tracking revictimization, juvenile justice, teen pregnancy, and domestic violence	*		
Utilization of the CAC	*		

* Less than 1% of respondents gave this answer.

Exhibit B.4. Percentage of CAC Directors Who Would Like to Engage in Each Type of Evaluation

Member		Nonmember	
Impact of CACs on children	40%	Client satisfaction	43%
MDT issues	36%	MDT issues	30%
Client satisfaction	31%	Impact of CACs on children	20%
Breadth and adequacy of CAC services	21%	Quality of forensic interviewers	19%
Agency satisfaction	21%	Breadth and adequacy of CAC services	15%
Pre-post evaluation of groups or therapy	13%	Agency satisfaction	14%
Impact of trained versus untrained child interviewers	13%	Prosecution rates	13%
Quality of forensic interviewers	11%	Impact of trained versus untrained child interviewers	8%
Mental health of staff	10%	Reliability of medical assessments	7%
Prevention of child sexual abuse	9%	Mental health of staff	3%
Prosecution rates	9%	Child satisfaction	3%
Timeliness in responding to a report	7%	Pre-post evaluation of groups or therapy	3%
Whether medical evidence affects prosecution	5%	Timeliness in responding to a report	3%
Effectiveness of a medical examination	4%	Peer review of videotaped interviews	3%
Completion of clinical services	3%	Paperwork protocols	3%
Child satisfaction	3%	How do cases close	*
Pre-post medical exam	2%	Risk factors for revictimization	*
Pre-post child interview	2%	Utilization of the CAC	*
Juvenile justice outcomes	2%	Expertise of personnel	*
Facility expansion	*	Prevention of child sexual abuse	*
Whether children are safer than before they disclosed	*	The effects of live versus videotaped testimony	*
Risk factors for revictimization	*	Effectiveness of court school	*
Public defenders' perceptions of the CAC	*	Ways to increase the sensitivity of FBI agents	*
Whether immediate parental support helps children improve faster	*	Ways to increase Tribal/non-Tribal coordination	*
Impact on siblings	*	Whether clients enter counseling	*
Factors contained in medical records that predict child sexual abuse	*	Whether the court process helped children feel secure	*
Expertise of personnel	*	How best to govern a CAC	*
Advisory Board	*	Increasing mental health coordination	*
Judges' perceptions of the CAC	*	The most useful case review methods	*
Ways to empower parents	*		
Mental health outcomes between domestic violence, child sexual abuse, and the CAC	*		

Exhibit B.4. **Percentage of CAC Directors Who Would Like to Engage in Each Type of Evaluation (continued)**

	Member	Nonmember
Utilization of the CAC	*	
Impact of CAC on prosecution	*	
Cost-benefit analysis	*	
Community residents' perceptions of the CAC (e.g., residents in the grocery store)	*	

* Less than 1% of respondents gave this answer.